

## NOTES FROM THE JUNE 8 BRC MEETING

### ATTENDEES

Betty Smedley  
Lyn Henderson  
Tony Lane  
John Pescosolido  
Jennifer Hackett  
Nikki Grover  
Jeffrey Fernandez  
Tom Baranouskas  
Karen Brown

HIGHLIGHTS: (Decisions/actions in bold)

### CURRENT ACTIVITIES

Betty summarized the current actions related to Contractor travel, and Safeguards and Security, and the draft Order on Conferences.

Lyn summarized the current activities related to FY00 and 01 budgetary action

The two pending conclusion memos to the recent BRC activities (budget validation and funds allocation) were discussed. Betty is in the process of reviewing the Budget Validation memo, and Mike Telson is grappling with an issue related to the Funds Allocation memo. This issue, the apparent conflict with the principles of providing the maximum funding to the field, while preserving flexibility to handle unforeseen funding needs, will be evaluated by a subset of the BRC (Tom, as lead, Jeffrey and Lyn). Tom will initiate a conference call.

### BRC/FMSIC MEETING REVIEW

The Council reviewed the results of the April BRC/FMSIC meeting. The following was decided:

There will be a joint BRC/FMSIC meeting in FY00. Jeffrey will act as the BRC liaison to the FMSIC site selection committee, and assure that the date is cognizant of the budget cycle, to allow for Program representation

It was acknowledged that robust Program representation is a key for BRC success. Lyn will have a discussion with Eli, Chuck, and Ralph to determine the cause of their lack of BRC participation. Based on those results, the BRC will decide the next steps.

There will be an additional Contractor represented, aligned with a more traditional SC Lab. Lyn will discuss potential candidates with Ralph. Mike Bartos from Argonne was discussed as a possibility.

### BRC FUTURE TOPICS

The top ten issues that were identified at the April BRC meeting were discussed and the following actions were agreed upon:

1) Reprogramming Process – A working group led by the DOE Budget Director will be established. The goal of this group will be to identify the problems with the current process and recommend steps to improve it. This group will also include Tony, Judy/Jennifer, John, Jeffrey, ALOO, Nikki, Barry Gafney, perhaps others.

Some of the issues that were identified include:

- Definition (notification V reprogramming)
- Variety of reprogrammings
- Roles and responsibilities
- Formal/informal
- Communication improvements/negative incentives in the current system
- Proliferation of concurrences
- Low thresholds
- Quality of field input is perceived as low
- Reprogramming requests disguised as requests for additional \$

Lyn will initiate a meeting or a conference call.

2) Crosscuts – It was recognized that this is an issue that has been worked periodically, most recently in the context of the functional cost reporting. It was decided that the BRC would contact the sponsors of the crosscuts to learn more about the usefulness, importance, etc. Jeffrey will draft a list of questions, obtain comment from the BRC, and Lyn will send the list out to the crosscut proponents.

3) Reengineering the IWO process – Most field personnel feel that the \$100K threshold is too low, and should be raised to \$500K or \$1M. Jennifer will take the lead to analyze the issue and recommend BRC action

4) Limited Period Appropriations – It was decided that the BRC will monitor Congressional actions related to any change from the status quo.

5) BMIS – It was decided that the BRC should participate in making value-added contributions to the BMIS effort. This will be accomplished by the participation of Tony, Jennifer, and John P., who are already on the steering committee

6) Benchmarking Best Practices – It was decided that the BRC should sponsor a clearinghouse for collecting and sharing best practices. Nikki volunteered to lead this effort, and work with Brian Morishita to use the existing FMSIC/BRC clearinghouse mechanism. Another idea that was adopted was to have an annual CFO award for best practices.

7) Capital to Operating conversions – No action due to lack of definition of a problem

8) Training – John Mathis will brief the BRC at the next meeting on the training program that he is involved with, and the BRC will discuss any next steps.

9) 9th digit B&R controls – The concern expressed at the Chicago meeting was related to perceived excess controls at the 9<sup>th</sup> digit. There seems to be inconsistent application depending on the field office and program. Jeffrey will gather data at the Budget Officer's workshop later this month, and report back at the next meeting.

10) Developing performance measures – The inherent difficulty of applying performance measures to Science activities was discussed. It was agreed that John Sullivan would attend the next meeting and share any insights that he may have on this issue.

Next meeting – The tentative date for the next meeting is Wednesday, September 15. Based on input from Ralph Delorenzo and Chuck Roy, this date may move to September 1 or 2.